

# **The Unity and Contrast between Gustaf Aulen's and L. Harold DeWolf's Christology**

Hiroshi Shigeru

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Sacred Theology, 1957

## **PREFACE**

In Japan there are two trends of Christian thought. One may be called the "liberal" trend which has existed longer than the other and is prevalent among the older ministers. The other may be called the "neo-orthodox" trend which came to Japan in the name of "Barthian theology," and has been spread in some major theological seminaries and among the younger ministers.

The question of the present author was what were the main differences between these two trends and what did they fundamentally emphasize. Since there are absurd misunderstandings of each other and unnecessary criticisms of each other, the question had to be answered as quickly as possible.

In order to answer it, he chose two present theologians who represent each trend. One is L. Harold DeWolf while the other is Gustaf Aulen. The former is a liberal theologian while the latter is neo-orthodox.

The author's discussion was concentrated on the doctrine of Christology which consists of the doctrine of the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Holy Spirit, the Trinity and the Church; because Christian theology prepares for Christology, or is Christology, or follows out the implications of Christology. In Japan, where less than one per cent of the entire population is Christian, the better and the stronger understanding of Christology is required.

The theological outlook is in the process of changing. In that respect these two theological trends have had a dominating

influence. The endeavors of any theology must be to see the Christian faith as it actually is, according to its uniqueness. At present, in spite of difference between the two schools, there is direction toward understanding the uniqueness of the Christian faith and, at least, there are great developments toward understanding each other.

The author wishes to express his gratitude to those professors who gave generously of their time to read and criticize the final draft of this thesis. First, I want to mention Professor Walter M. Horton who offered important criticisms concerning the sections of the thesis. There were two more instructors who offered important suggestions and corrections: Dr. James W. Lee and Dr. Richard C. Wolf. The author is grateful to the School of Theology, Oberlin College, for the opportunity to complete his work for the degree of Master of Sacred Theology.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

There is a theological renaissance today. Since Karl Barth's *Commentary on Romans* there has been a deepening consciousness that there is a radical settlement to be made between Christianity and the thought and values of the modern world. In the modern period of Christianity there was an emphasis on the question, "How can the Christian faith be made intelligible within and in harmony with the highest idealism and scientific thought of our civilization?" Now the question is, "What is there in the Christian faith which gives us such an understanding of ourselves that we must assert our loyalty to the Holy God above all the splendid and yet corruptible values of our civilization?"<sup>1</sup> This neo-orthodox movement has influenced all aspects of theology. In Germany old liberalism was completely opposed by neo-orthodoxy. In America old liberalism was also influenced by neo-orthodoxy in a lessar degree than in Germany but "it is the essential genius of (the liberal theology) to fit its message to the time in which it lives."<sup>2</sup> Thus the liberal trend finds its own way to

go though it was given the new light by neo-orthodoxy. Its aim is, "let our new (liberal theology) . . . be respectful of classic Christian orthodoxy, and willing to learn from the new orthodoxy; but let it be unmercifully critical of all merely archaic and irrelevant elements in the Christian tradition, and eagerly sensitive to all genuine points of contact between the Gospel and the contemporary mind."<sup>3</sup> Thus we have two leading theological trends, neo-orthodox and neo-liberal theology.

Consequently we have two main trends in Christology. Generally speaking, there were two watchwords, "Jesus of history" and "Christ of faith." This was the difference between old liberalism and neo-orthodoxy. At present the difference between neo-liberal and neo-orthodox theology is much less than it was. What is the unity and contrast between these two trends in Christology? To answer this question we will investigate two leading theologians, L. Harold De Wolf and Gustaf Aulen. The former is a Boston Methodist theologian who is neo-liberal and the latter is a Swedish Lutheran theologian who is neo-orthodox. DeWolf's book, *A Theology of the Living Church*,<sup>4</sup> is "the best recent liberal theology textbook" while Aulen's book, *The Faith of the Christian Church*,<sup>5</sup> is "the best systematic presentation of neo-orthodox Protestantism."<sup>6</sup> The purpose of this thesis is to compare them and to see their unity as well as difference in Christology.

Through this survey we shall find their unity which is often overlooked by both theologians and also their contrast which depends partially on their own individual theological interest and partially on inescapable difference in theology. Thus first of all we shall contrast them by making direct quotations from each theologian and find out their unity as well as difference in Christology. This thesis consists of two main parts: the first part is on methodology and the second part is on Christology. Part one consists of five chapters: the function of systematic theology, faith, revelation, reason, and experience. Part two consists of seven chapters: background, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, the Last Judgment, and the Nature of the Christian Church.

The whole discussion ends with a brief statement of conclusions.

A remark may be added to this introduction. In our survey we shall note that both theologians completely agree that the essence of Christianity in its entire content is defined by the act of God in Christ. In spite of different emphasis in Christology both come close to each other in their doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, and the Nature of the Church. Thus we may say that as the Incarnation is completed in the Atonement, Christology is completed in Ecclesiology.

Part I, Methodology will be omitted. It consists of the following chapters, the function of systematic theology, faith, revelation, reason and experience.

## PART II CHRISTOLOGY

### CHAPTAR 7

#### BACKGROUND

The essence of Christian faith is nothing else than the fact of Jesus Christ. Our Christian faith has an unshakable ultimate foundation in the event of Jesus Christ, and our salvation is based on the same event for this event unites the final power of salvation with the final truth of revelation.

Christian thought about God and man is determined by the accounting we give of who Jesus Christ is and what he does. So "Christian theology," as Daniel D. Williams says, "prepares for Christology, or is Christology, or follows out the implications of Christology."<sup>1</sup>

We find some important differences, at least in emphasis, between the Christology of Aulen and that of DeWolf. Although our faith is grounded in the divine revelation and this revelation can be apprehended only by the eye of faith (in other words, although revelation is not real without the receiving side and is not real without the giving side), Aulen's emphasis seems to depend on the giving side and DeWolf's emphasis on the receiving

side. In this chapter, we shall see these differences in the background of Christology conditioning all their teaching.

In spite of these differences in their Christologies, they agree that Jesus is the Christ, our Savior, both because he could become the Christ and because he was received as the Christ, our Savior, and without both these sides he would not have been the Christ. This is remarkable in contrast to two schools which are, on the one hand, the so-called old liberal theology which was apt to emphasize the "Jesus of History," confusing humanity even at its best with the divine, and, on the other hand, the so-called early dialectical theology which was apt to emphasize the "Christ of faith," tending to detach the exalted "spiritual Christ" from the historical Jesus.

### 1. Historical Background

Let us see their historical background and their main interest in theology. Generally speaking, Aulen's background is Swedish Lutheran while DeWolf's is Boston Personalism. In other words, the former is neo-orthodox while the latter is neo-liberal.

Historically, Sweden is a land of theological conservatism.<sup>2</sup> The dominating theological tendency has been in line with Lutheran orthodoxy, or at least, in line with traditionalistic supernaturalism. Among all religious circles, except for a few emancipated thinkers, the Biblical world-view, seen through a Pauline-Lutheran evangelicalism, has formed the dominating religious background.<sup>3</sup> In the theological field, Sweden has been historically dependent, to a large extent, on Germany, the homeland of both historic Lutheranism and theological construction.<sup>4</sup> Sweden is bound by her history to German Lutheranism.<sup>5</sup>

In the middle of the nineteenth century Sweden was won philosophically for idealism by the thorough, systematic work of its greatest philosopher, Christopher Jakob Bostrom. But in spite of the religious, even Christocentric, nature of much of this philosophy, and in spite of friendly approaches from the side of the philosophers, the theologians spent their efforts in furious

battle against this undermining of strict traditionalism. Here came to be born an effective synthesis of conservative and liberal fundamentals.

It was during the last half of the nineteenth century that "new" theological tendencies began to be noticeable in Sweden. The theology of Schleiermacher was represented at the university of Lund by J. H. Thomander and Heinrich Reuterdaahl.<sup>6</sup> The Ritschlian appeal to history was to have a strong influence on Swedish thought, but not without admixtures of metaphysics and mysticism received from the philosophic and literary sources of Swedish liberalism.

It is true that in the twentieth century Sweden has shown that it has a distinctive contribution to make to theology. Aulen says that "Swedish theology has never been so independent and active as now in the twentieth century."

What was the strength of the theology of the end of the nineteenth century and what are the main differences between it and the theology of the twentieth century in Sweden?

The strength of theology of the end of the nineteenth century lies in its emphasis on history, personality, and ethics. But the emphasis on history led only to the past, and therefore to neglect of the present working of God—a neglect of the present revelation. The emphasis on personality led to individualism. The emphasis on the ethical view gave the religious element only a subordinate place. These are the weaknesses of the dominant theology of the generation preceding our own. Thus, says Aulen,

The programme of that theology (of the nineteenth century) can be summed up in three catch-words: Christianity should be interpreted, first, historically; second, personally; third, ethically.

1. Christianity should be interpreted historically. . . . In the last part of the nineteenth century the critical investigation of the documents of Christianity was making greater progress than ever before. . . . The history of Christian thought was being carefully treated from new and productive points of view.<sup>7</sup>

But at last, the comparative study of religion appeared and tried to explain the relations between Christianity and other religions. Thus the chief subject for this kind of theology was historical inquiry. The questions of living faith were largely neglected.

2. Further, the theology of 1900 interpreted Christianity from a personal point of view. Personality was a highly esteemed word in the theology of the last generation.... Only personal views are legitimate. The importance of the Reformation was thought to be found in its emphasis on personality. But in reality this part of the programme was worked out more in a negative than in a positive way.<sup>8</sup>

Though the programme that Christianity should be understood and interpreted in a personal way is so far a right one,<sup>9</sup> the most serious weakness is to be found in the fact that the significance of the personal view was not analysed from the positive side. The result was that "personal" was confounded with "individualistic." Thus the individualistic element was too strong. The center was the individual, his independence and self-assertion.

3. The theology of the end of the nineteenth century stressed the necessity for an ethically sound and strong Christianity. Only what bore a clear moral stamp was legitimately Christian. At the same time this ethical view served an apologetic interest.<sup>10</sup>

This theology's emphasis was on the ethical side of Christianity. It did not make clear that everything in Christianity has its center in living communion with God, and that the essential fact is this communion for its own sake. Thus faith was esteemed less for its own sake than for the sake of the values connected with it.

At the beginning of the present century the theological faculty at Uppsala was not inspiring for men who were influenced by what is generally known as liberalism.<sup>11</sup> What were the fundamental motives for this change?

According to Aulen, first, Christianity is to be interpreted as dynamic and as drama. He says:

Christianity is to be seen as the living spiritual power that it really is.... We should not indeed reject the past, but see it in the light of the present, and so recognize how God's will manifests itself in history. Christianity is in its essence a spiritual power, which flows as a living stream through all ages.<sup>12</sup>

Christianity is not only dynamic: it is also dramatic. The theology of the nineteenth century was far too evolutionary to be able to accept this dramatic point of view. It put Christianity in a frame of monistic philosophy, and did not see that the Divine Will manifests itself only conquering resistance. It generally overlooked what it did not care to see—namely, those facts in life that oppose the Will of God. It is not enough to maintain that God is Love.

Secondly, we can lay a new emphasis on the Church. But personality is not to be confounded with individualism. Christianity is a living spiritual power, a permanent and continuous spiritual life. In this community the individual shares, and he received his part of its treasures. The individual Christian derives his life from this community; he lives in it and for it.... If it is the characteristic of Christianity that it captures us by the power of the sovereign Divine Will, if as Luther says, it takes us away from ourselves (*Deus rapit nos a nobis et ponit nos extra nos*), then all communion with God *eo ipso* means that we enter into the hard work which this Divine Will has to do in the world of human souls.<sup>13</sup>

It has been characteristic of recent Swedish theology to emphasize the importance of the Christian Church as a living spiritual continuity. This thought has been very closely connected with the dynamic and dramatic view mentioned before.

The third point is to emphasize the necessity of a purely religious view of Christianity. It means that:

I am not defending any pre-Kantian metaphysics, but emphasizing that all in Christianity has its center in God, and in God alone. Faith must be valued for its own sake, and not for the sake of utilitarian values, or indeed of any "values," even though the highest possible. Theology has to explain the meaning of living faith. And if this is to be done, it is obvious that Christianity cannot be defined in ethical terms



alone. All depends upon communion with God, and whatever faith asserts it asserts about God.<sup>14</sup>

Thus we ought to see God's Love and God's Holiness as a unity and recognize that God remains the Unfathomable, even when we experience His Love as fully as possible: "the peace of God passeth all understanding."<sup>15</sup> These remarks give the background of Aulen's theology.

A liberal theology benefiting from the philosophy of personal idealism has had a brilliant history in Methodism. This theological current has issued primarily from thinkers at both the School of Theology and in the department of philosophy in Boston University. Originating there in the work of Borden P. Bowne, it has come to us through the late contemporary, Edgar S. Brightman and is now being continued by the efforts of P. A. Bertocci in the department of philosophy in Boston University while it has come to us through Albert Knudson and is now being continued by the efforts of L. H. DeWolf in the School of Theology at Boston University.

DeWolf organizes recent theological tendencies in three steps: 1) Liberal and naturalistic accommodations, 2) The neo-orthodox reaction, and 3) The road ahead.

According to DeWolf the liberal movement as a whole has shown, historically, certain characteristic points of strength and weakness. One purpose of the liberal movement has been to put the Christian message in terms understandable and persuasive to the people of the present age.<sup>16</sup> The liberals of the early twentieth century sought to accommodate the gospel to the methods and categories commonly employed in an age of natural science, while, at the same time, exacting certain requirements of the sciences themselves. Another characteristic point is a spirit of open-mindedness to new evidences such as may come from any science or any type of experience. The next point is a great advantage in the evangelistic task. Where men recognize the obligation to offer an open mind to all evidences from every quarter it can be insisted that those who have dogmatically rejected the Christian

faith are obliged to examine its claims.<sup>17</sup> The next point is the eagerness of liberal theologians to embrace critical literary and historical methods in the study of the Bible. "Christians have always insisted that theirs was a historical religion, that heaven came to earth in the life of Jesus Christ so he was as truly a historical personage as Julius Caesar."<sup>18</sup>

DeWolf does not forget to mention defects of the liberal movement. There are three defects according to him. The first is the neglect of the Bible. The rejection of the infallibility of the Scripture, the emphasis on a highly technical Bible study, and the emphasis of "learning by doing," and "experience-centered teaching," caused this tendency to neglect biblical preaching and instruction. The second liability of the liberal movement is its predisposition to gradualism. "This preference for gradualism was partially offset in the earlier days of the movement by the great wave of optimism which supported the hope to win "the world for Christ in this generation."<sup>19</sup> A third critical question concerns a certain tendency to substitute this worldly trust in human achievement for a world-transcending confidence in God. These are defects of the liberal movement.

Concerning the contributions and defects of neo-orthodoxy DeWolf says, firstly, "the neo-orthodox have opened to many persons the possibility of a profound interest in the message of the Bible without falling into fundamentalist literalism or uncritical methods of study."<sup>20</sup> The second point is the great stress on the necessity of passionate commitment to God, escaping all the sophisticated indecision for the absolute development of faith. The third point is the many useful warnings given against the hasty oversimplification of our problems and especially identification of Christianity with ambiguous social movements. Thus as a whole, DeWolf speaks about the contributions of neo-orthodoxy:

Neo-orthodoxy has...had the great value of enlivening theology. It has been a dramatically stated point of view, revealing in starting paradoxes and rhetorical exaggerations. It has stirred up more excitement than had been seen in theology in many a year. It has caught the attention of many people

who were never interested in theology before. That is a great service, particularly in a period when too many church people had substituted vague sentiments for such thoughtful and passionately held convictions as can give to a church real solidarity and strength.<sup>21</sup>

But also Dewolf criticizes neo-orthodoxy. In the first place, there is a lack of consistency, even a reckless disregard for consistency. Next, there is a lack of constructive guidance. "Negative criticism is important, but someone must build."<sup>22</sup> There is also a too negative view of man. He says,

Neo-orthodoxy has been weak in the building positively a constructive program of hopeful action. It is bound to be weak as a constructive force so long as it stresses man's sinfulness more than his capacity for goodness and for communion with God.<sup>23</sup>

The next point is about the vague thought of God in neo-orthodoxy. According to DeWolf the neo-orthodox idea of God never becomes quite clear as to whether this God is really a Father with whom we can communicate. He may be personal but also impersonal; this is the paradox. One further point is the weak communication between the Christian and the world. This is because neo-orthodoxy refuses to construct positively a bridge from theology to philosophy or philosophy to theology, or between theology and the sciences. Thus, he concludes,

Neo-orthodoxy has been an exceedingly useful, corrective counterweight. It has served as a useful way station. It is not a substantial dwelling place. That is why...it is now being rapidly modified among its first-rank representatives. It is destined...to have made a great contribution to American theology, but before long it will be the vogue to look back on the days when neo-orthodoxy was in the saddle.<sup>24</sup>

His strong emphasis on the road ahead is laid on necessary critical involvement in culture, interpenetration of faith and reason, divine moral norms, revelation and human experience and free men in a responsible society. His emphasis is always that faith itself gives courage and is most secure when put into direct interchange

with life from every quarter. The mistakes made in this process will not be so damaging nor so hard to correct as would be the mistake of isolating Christian belief from full participation in the intellectual task.

We cannot forget his emphasis on divine morality. He says, "He who defends the doctrine of an absolute, objective moral law is not fighting against the sciences. He is defending the very foundation of the sciences, as well as many other precious values."<sup>25</sup>

As we have already seen, both Aulen and DeWolf criticize old liberal theology because it substitutes human ideals for divine work. Aulen himself is neo-orthodox. Even DeWolf is influenced by neo-orthodoxy but tries to overcome the weak points of neo-orthodoxy on liberal foundations. This gives common orientation to Aulen's and DeWolf's theology. Aulen's emphasis, however, is always on the divine will and sovereignty while DeWolf's emphasis is always on the application of the divine will to the new situation where we live.

## 2. Faith in God and Faith in Christ

Both agree that faith in God is faith in Christ. But the nuance is very different. Aulen stresses Christocentricity as well as theocentricity while DeWolf stresses human repentance through the work of Christ which is divine work.

According to Aulen all Christian faith is faith in God. All typically Christian faith is at the same time centered in Christ. In other words, Christian faith has only one object. It is concerned with God alone. At the same time Christian faith began as faith in Christ. Says Aulen:

Faith in Christian is the safeguard of Christian faith. It is not a faith in something besides God, but a faith in that God who was incarnate in Christ and in him reveals his essence and realizes his will. Faith in Christ defines the Christian relation to God and the nature of God, positively and qualitatively. . . . . Christian faith is Christocentric just because it is theocentric.<sup>26</sup>

Where Christ is, there is God ; and where Christ works, there God realizes his will. The work of Christ is God's own work, not something separated from him. So to emphasize Christocentricity is nothing else but to emphasize theocentricity in order to focus on a conception of God which is possible under the conditions to which human life is subject.

Aulen is very careful to avoid misleading interpretations of the relation between faith in God and faith in Christ. There are three types of those. The first occurs when Christ is separated from God and conceived of as an intermediary being. The second, when Christ is identified with God and takes his place. And the third, when the divine Being is, so to speak, divided between God and Christ. These three interpretations are wrong. Because in the first case the most vital center of Christian faith, viz., God himself who is incarnate in Christ and acts through him, will be obscured. This tends to deny that God's approach to man is through Christ and his work. It happened in Arianism and in nineteenth century Idealism. In the second case of which Modalism is typical, Christ becomes synonymous with the entire concept of God and one fails to see that the real question is about a revelation of God and that the revelation takes place in history in the despised man, Christ. In the third case of which Latin Scholasticism is typical, the act of Christ is not understood as God's own act. But when the work of Christ is conceived of as the work of God, it becomes impossible to ascribe a greater degree of divine love to Christ than to God.<sup>27</sup>

DeWolf meets this problem with an emphasis on religious experience and philosophical considerations as well as the evidence of Scripture. Through the testimony of religious experience, men of all ages, in communion with God, have sought and often found in Him a source of strength far transcending the uncertainties of earth. God is one who has created us and redeemed us, who confronts and addresses us and to whom we give thanks and pray. He is shown as the divine Other. In the divine-human encounter a human being does not confront and address himself. In spite

of his equal stress with Aulen upon the divine-human encounter, his emphasis does show "insistence upon the centrality of the historical personality of Jesus Christ for our faith and our salvation." He says:

In balancing tension with the doctrine of divine transcendence must be placed the truth that God is also immanent in us and our world...He (God) sustains us and continuously we are dependent upon him... (Thus) without the support of His will none of us could exist even for an hour.<sup>28</sup>

He shows both ways between God and man. "When a man thinks a thought of God after Him, no identity of process or being is implied, but only an identity of meanings apprehended. A sharing of truth is, however, no mean kind of sharing. In the apprehension of God's thoughts we experience significant divine immanence."<sup>29</sup> God's activity continually affects our experience. At the point where all being is continuously dependent on God's sustaining will, DeWolf and Aulen have the same stress. But the former extends this divine will into our experience directly while the latter emphasizes rather the work of God and minimizes the Christian experience except for the fact that divine revelation can be apprehended by the eye of faith. In this point DeWolf expresses himself.

Whether we suppose that God acts upon our consciousness immediately, to produce our sense perceptions, as many idealists would maintain, or indirectly, through a long or short chain of mediate causes, His purpose is finally affecting us in all our experiences of the physical order.<sup>30</sup>

DeWolf emphasizes the Christian experiences in which God lives and is near, while Aulen emphasizes the divine revelation in the Christian faith. He takes precautions against the subjective and psychological conception of faith, or the experiential theology, while DeWolf takes precautions against the objective and dry conception of faith. Thus DeWolf follows St. Augustine's idea concerning the way of salvation which "passes through Christ as man to Christ as God."

Both Aulen and DeWolf agree that faith in God is faith in

Christ. But the nuance is different. Aulen stresses transcendental and DeWolf immanent relationships between God and Christ. God is immanent in the world as its permanent creative ground and is transcendent to the world through freedom. The transcendence demanded by religious experience is the freedom-to-freedom relationship which is actual in every personal encounter. We, however, find the same difference of nuance between Aulen and DeWolf in their interpretations of Christian history. If one emphasizes the immanence of God and of Jesus Christ, and the humanity of Jesus, his motif depends on emphasizing the ethical side of our Christian faith. It happened in the Antiochian School. If one emphasizes the transcendence of God and of Jesus Christ, and the divinity of Christ, his motif depends on emphasizing the redemptive power of our Christian faith. It happened in the Alexandrian School. As long as these two keep up a tension between themselves, Christological controversy will continue to be vital. Sometimes one is extremely polemic and sometimes the other. Sometimes they are close, and sometimes they are at a distance. Now we find the same rhythm between Aulen and DeWolf. They are pretty close because both of them deal with the Christian faith as *living reality* and because both emphasize the transcendence *and* immanence of God, and agree that "a transcendent and immanent Christ can be the Way to the transcendent and immanent God." But still there is a difference or a different nuance between these two. Aulen's first concern always is for the transcendence of God and DeWolf's for the immanence of God though they avoid the polemic emphasis on either one. We shall see this kind of unity and contrast in the following chapters.

## CHAPTER 8

### THE INCARNATION

Was Jesus a human person? This question raises an ancient difficulty which is stated as a dilemma. If we insist that Jesus

was a human person we are driven either into a paradoxical conception of a double personality in the incarnate Son of God, or else into the Christology of Liberal Protestantism. If we deny that Jesus was a human person, we deny by implication the completeness of his manhood and stand convicted of Apollinarianism. But in the New Testament He who dies and rises is truly man as well as God. Throughout Christian history the Chalcedonian formula has held the two sides of the Christian affirmation together. At Chalcedon the Council declared that our Lord Jesus Christ "is at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man," and that he is "one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten recognized in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation—the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person and subsistence." In the history of Christian thought as it has worked out from the Chalcedonian formula of the two natures, the greatest difficulty has been to assure that the real humanity of Jesus is affirmed. As Donald M. Baillie pointed out, there are two rejected extremes in the present Christological situation. One is "no more Docetism, no more Monophysite explaining away of the human character of the life that Jesus lived, but a full and unreserved recognition of His human nature as '*homo-ousios*' with our own, which means 'essentially the same as ours.'"<sup>1</sup> Another is "no more historicism. It is indeed a new variety of historical scepticism about the Gospels as sources for a 'life of Jesus' or a reconstruction of His personality."<sup>2</sup>

Between Aulen and DeWolf, we find the same opinions against Christological heresies and the same emphasis on the fact that Jesus Christ is truly God and truly man. But we find different stresses concerning the Incarnation. Aulen's first concern is the divine loving will in Christ while DeWolf's first concern is Jesus as He really was, that is, Jesus Christ in the New Testament. Related to this difference, both theologians' understanding of the relationship between Incarnation and Atonement is also different.



Aulen shows clearly the fact that the Incarnation is completed on the cross while DeWolf's idea of this relationship is quite flat. Now we shall see this unity and contrast in detail.

## 1. AGAINST HERESIES

Aulen and DeWolf have generally rejected the same views. On the one hand both theologians oppose all tendencies to separate Christ from God, so that Christ would become an intermediary being, and on the other hand, they oppose all attempts to identify Christ with God.

Aulen, stressing that the confession of faith in Christ stands in a double antithesis, rejects the separation Christology which involves the conception of Christ as an intermediary being, whether this is stated in such a way that Christ becomes some king or half-God, or on the basis of an idealistic line of thought, Jesus is conceived as "the ideal man," "humanity's prototype," etc. He says,

The first type appears to some extent even in the Apologists, who talk about Christ as an "other" (lower) God. It appears later in the so-called Dynamic Monarchianism, and above all in Arianism, which later returned in more subtle forms. This rejected separation-Christology was strongly influenced by the god and Logos concepts of Greek philosophy. Wherever this philosophy has had a positive influences on Christology, it has led to a conception of Christ as an intermediary being. The presupposition is that God is conceived of as a being enthroned in isolated majesty, and the philosophical idea of Logos is well adapted to serve this metaphysical conception of God.<sup>3</sup>

This separation-Christology was rejected by the ancient church doctrine of the Incarnation. Because the Son is of the same substance with the Father; it is the divine nature itself which is incarnate in Christ, not an intermediary being. The anti-thesis is really the same in Neo-Platonism. "The idea of the Incarnation of the divine is entirely foreign to Neo-Platonism, inasmuch as the Deity remains in his isolated exaltation and the process

of emanation is in reality conceived of as a fall into sin.”<sup>4</sup>

On this point, DeWolf has the same idea. He says,

Among those (several theories concerning Jesus rejected by the authority of the church) it was especially clear that the church could not accept semipagan, syncretistic views, like that of Carpocrates, which assigned to Jesus a supernatural, divine nature but made similar affirmation concerning such men as Plato and Aristotle. The church had no intention of making Christ a member of a new pantheon.<sup>5</sup>

The Ebionites and Adoptionists are in this line of heresy. A more famous heresy was Arianism. Arius “taught that Jesus was the incarnation of a pre-existent being generated before anything else in all creation, but nevertheless subordinate to God and not, like Him, existent from eternity.”<sup>6</sup> Thus monotheism was too thoroughly established at the heart of the Christian faith to permit any doctrine about a divinity other than the one true God. Moreover, it was precisely God, and not a god, whose presence was believed to have been made known in Christ and about whom the Christian gospel was good news.

Aulen and DeWolf agree together against the heresy of interpreting Christ as an intermediary being and both stress together the fact that Jesus Christ has not a divinity other than the one true God.

On the other hand both theologians reject all attempts to identify Christ with God. This kind of heresy is typically revealed in the docetic and quasi-docetic doctrines. Aulen calls it the theophany. He says,

The theophany type includes all endeavors to identify Christ with God in such a way that the historical is removed and the concrete human features disappear from the person of Christ. Among these are such Christological types as Docetism and Modalism, which reappear after Nicaea in somewhat milder form in Monophysitism, Monotheletism, and other related forms. If separation-Christology has been influenced by Greek philosophy, the decisive influence in theophany-Christology came from the Hellenistic mystery cults.<sup>7</sup>

The formula of Chalcedon declares that Christ is not a divinity

wandering around in disguise on the earth, but that he is our brother and a man like us. The real purpose of the doctrine of the "two natures", which are inseparably and indivisibly united without change and confusion, was to maintain both his unity of substance with the Father and his "true humanity."

DeWolf has the same stress on this point. He says,

The church could no more accept an attempt to solve the problem concerning Christ by the device of affirming that he was simply God appearing *incognito* as a man, masquerading as what He was not in very truth.<sup>8</sup>

Although the early Councils repeatedly declared, against the docetic and quasi-docetic doctrines, that Jesus was fully human, still great numbers of Christians, both learned theologians and untutored laymen, have been reluctant to draw the inevitable inferences of limited knowledge, moral struggle and spiritual growth in the life of the Master.

Aulen and DeWolf agree together against the heresy of identifying Christ with God, thus viewing him as a god visiting this world, and both stress together the fact that Jesus was fully human.

Having agreed together against the two heretical views, the two theologians henceforth take separate ways. Aulen begins to use the deductive method in order to find the heretical Christologies in Christian history, while DeWolf begins to use the inductive method in order to emphasize Jesus as He really was, that is, Jesus Christ in the New Testament.

According to Aulen the real significance of the struggle of the ancient church is that the fundamental ideas of Christianity are maintained, both against that Hellenization which had its roots in Greek philosophy and tended toward a separation of Christ from God, and against that which had its roots in the mystery cults and resulted in an identification of Christ with God analogous to divine theophanies.

Scholastic theology, both older and more recent, "has always endeavored to elucidate and explain how the divine nature in

Christ is connected with the human. In reality these explanations tended to favor the theophany type of Christology, or in other words to obscure the 'true humanity.'"<sup>9</sup>

Against this scholastic theology a humanized Christology during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, based on idealistic philosophy, was to emphasize the "true humanity." "But the result was simply a change from the theophany type to the separation type. Christ became a kind of intermediary being.... This means that, contrary to the intention, the human individuality was not properly expressed and the result was the creation of an unrealistic and fantastic being who, as an intermediary being, was in reality neither god nor man."<sup>10</sup>

Thus the failure of scholastic theology consists in its inability to comprehend clearly the lowliness of the historical and human elements while the defect of idealistic Christology lies partially in its inability to accomplish the intention to emphasize the true humanity of Christ and, even more important, in the fact that Christian faith is not concerned with an idealized humanity, but with the divine, with God.

DeWolf's criticism of Christology is focused on the Christology of over-reaction against the "Jesus of history." He defends "Jesus as He really was in His life on earth." This does not mean "Jesus as a figure which can be described and authenticated by a cold and detached criticism."<sup>11</sup> Criticising Bultmann's Christology, he writes:

To most readers of the New Testament it seems undeniable that in the faith of the early church, Paul included, it was precisely the teachings, character and works of Jesus which first focused attention on his crucifixion. Could any carpenter, chosen at random, have drawn to himself such disciples and become the central figure in their faith? It is ironical that such men as Bultmann and Barth should especially identify their own faith with the faith of the ancient church and yet believe the central historical figure of that historical faith hardly worthy of serious historical study.<sup>12</sup>

If there is no revelation, no unveiling of God in the human person-

ality and career of Jesus, but only a veiling, how are we the better off because of the coming of God in Christ? DeWolf insists that we should remember that God saves us by revealing Himself to us, enlightening our minds with the knowledge of Himself, not in a 'Gnostic' sense, but by the way of Incarnation in a real human life. His aim is to get rid of over-emphasized reaction against previous one-sided and mistaken theological emphases upon the "historical Jesus." This criticism should be applied to Aulen's Christology which is a much less over-emphasized reaction against the "historical Jesus" than is to be seen in some German dialectical theologians.

## 2. MAIN STRESSES IN THE INCARNATION

When we look for main stresses in the nature of Incarnation between these two theologians, we find both of them try to discern the true figure of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. But Aulen approaches Christ from a Pauline-Lutheran background while DeWolf does it from the New Testament in general. In consequence the divine and loving will in Christ is emphasized in Aulen while the vivid picture of Jesus Christ as true man and as true God is emphasized in DeWolf.

Aulen's chief idea is that God was incarnate in the man Jesus Christ. Thus Christ is "of the same substance with the Father," the "substance" of the Father is "incarnate" in Christ.

The Christian confession of faith in Christ is essentially a confession of faith in the incarnation of divine love, of God, in the man Jesus Christ. It is by deliberate choice that we here accept the principal word of the ancient church: incarnation... This expression affirms first and last that the revelation in Christ has reference to God's approach to man and that divine love itself here enters the hostile and finite world. It affirms that the "essence" of God, or in other words the divine and loving will, "dwells" in Christ (John 1:14).<sup>13</sup>

The divine revelation is a divine self-impartment. It is, as stated in the old confession about Christ, "life of life, light of light." God gives nothing less than himself. Thus the Incarnation stresses

the gospel of the divine self-giving and it declares that no one but God, or divine love itself, dwells in Christ and performs the work of redemption. For Aulen the Incarnation means the Incarnation of divine love, *agape*. This is one of the most important characteristics in the Lundensian theology. The sum and substance of the revelation is that God is spontaneous, unmotivated, value-indifferent love creative of fellowship. God is *agape*. To prove this main theme Aulen writes as follows:

The highest and last word about the God of the Christ-dead is the word concerning God's *agape*. God's nature, as Luther says, is '*eitel Liebe!*' ... Thus in the last analysis all the utterances of Christian faith gather around God's *agape* as its center. This *agape* breaks to pieces all legalistic or rationalistic frames.... Faith can never go deeper than to the divine *agape*.<sup>14</sup>

God's love is God's definite disclosure in the Incarnation. There is only one way between man and God, and this way is always God's way to man, the way of the divine *agape*. This deep and powerful divine *agape* which was the dualistic-dramatic action in which God conquers death, sin and the devil—this was the leading motif in the early Church. For Aulen "the Reformation, again, was a return to the classical motif; *sola gratia—sola fides* are the definitions of God's *agape* seen respectively from the point of view God or of man."<sup>15</sup> The *agape* in *contra legem* and *contra rationem*, and is spontaneous, unconditioned, unmotivated, value-indifferent love.

How does Aulen deal with the historical Jesus? For him the idea of the Incarnation will lead sometimes to ambiguous interpretations of the nature of divine revelation when the "essence" of God is understood in a more or less "physical" sense. He has pointed out the naturalistic concepts in the eighteenth century as a false lead, but he himself seems to overlook the vivid figure of Jesus of history. His emphasis in dealing with Jesus Christ the Lord lies upon the unity of will between him and God which indicates his unity of substance with the Father.

The deed of Christ removes the veil and reveals the heart of God. Christ is "the effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance" (Heb. 1:3). He is not identical with God, he and the Father are "one" (John 10:30); one in will, in purpose, and in work.... "The substance of the Son" is not only like the Father's, it is the same; and the love of Christ is to faith the love of God himself. Where Christ is, there is God; and where Christ is active, there God is active also. The self-sacrificing and self-giving love of Christ is the love of God himself, its struggle against evil is God's own struggle, and its victory is God's own victory. In the deed of Christ God realizes his own will and love.<sup>16</sup>

Thus the true meaning of the Incarnation is obscured as soon as something other than God's "disposition of heart" becomes essential and as soon as the idea of a more or less "physical" unity of substance appears. The import of the question is nothing else than the heart of God.

Let our eyes turn to the history of recent Swedish theology. The event of 1905 when the union between Sweden and Norway was finally dissolved coincided with the new lease of life and the new enthusiasm which was springing up at Uppsala. "They (the student circles in the university of Uppsala) wished to open the eyes of their countrymen to their great discovery that the God of history is a living God (which was Söderblom's great emphasis), and that He is truly the same today. The great truth still stands 'My father worketh until now.'"<sup>17</sup> This inner motive of truth in a living God and a living divine will has been developed along with the Lutheran motive.<sup>18</sup> This main stream has flowed on until today. In his early writing, Aulen says, "It is to be recognized always where human hearts are broken down, captured and conquered, through the sovereign Love of the Divine Will."<sup>19</sup> The way of God's Will in reality was a way of the Cross. The main theme was fully developed in *The Faith of the Christian Church* in agreement with the simple and expressive word of Luther "We find the heart and will of the Father in Christ." Thus Aulen's main emphasis is rather on the will of God than upon "physical" unity of substance. "It is meaningless to attempt to draw a

distinction between God's will and his nature or his substance. If God is 'spirit' (John 4:24), then there is nothing more 'substantial' and essential than his will and his disposition of heart." <sup>20</sup> So Christ's unity of substance with the Father means nothing less than the Incarnation of the divine and loving will in Christ.

According to Aulen, the reverse of the fact that the Son is of the same substance with the Father is also true. That is the fact that the Father is of the same substance with the Son. Thus the confession of faith in Christ is not a statement about Christ, but an affirmation about that God who has revealed himself. This point is explained more fully by DeWolf, though Aulen does not overlook it.

DeWolf's chief idea is the emphasis on both the humanity of Jesus and the Son of God in the New Testament. The truth about the humanity of Christ and the Son of God is a matter concerning which all of our important sources of information are in the New Testament.

Concerning the humanity of Jesus, he rejects the tendency to minimize or even deny the manhood of Jesus. According to Roman Catholic doctrine, it is taught that the humanity of Jesus was an "impersonal humanity," "his *persona* being the Second Person of the Trinity, so that he was God assuming an impersonal human nature." <sup>21</sup> Their emphasis on the holy mysteries in the life of God tends to set Jesus further and further away from true humanity. Another dangerous theological movement away from the historical insistence on Christ's humanity is in the conservative neo-orthodox reaction against the exclusively humanitarian trend of modern Protestant teaching. They emphasize the full deity of Christ in such a way as to deny by omission that he was really a man at all.

The New Testament picture Jesus as the mediator who reveals God to men and reconciles men with their Creator. But this mediator is no third kind of being suspended midway between heaven and earth. Paul wrote, "For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and man, and the man Christ Jesus."



Concerning the humanity of Jesus he cites the Gospels :

According to the record of the Gospels Jesus' body was fashioned in the womb of a human mother and he was born into helpless infancy. In the Scriptures there is no suggestion of that infant prodigy who was believed by some ancient Christians to have possessed all the wisdom and power of God, instructing the wise and performing miracles from his crib. Instead he is described as the "babe lying in a manger," being carried here and there by his parents and gradually growing toward manhood.<sup>22</sup>

Against the violent reaction of dialectical theology, he stresses that as regards the New Testament, it is absurd to suggest that it knows nothing of any sort of interest in human character and personality, and, in particular, in the character and personality of Jesus Christ:—

In his mature ministry his bodily humanity was evident. He is reported to have grown tired and slept. He became hungry, not only after a long fast but on other occasions as well. He grew thirsty and once used his thirst as a common human bridge of communication. . . . If there is any fact concerning Jesus which can be established beyond reasonable doubt it is known that his body was a human, moral body and that he was tortured to death on a cross.<sup>23</sup>

The New Testament shows us not only the bodily humanity of Jesus Christ but also his humanity of soul. The Jesus of the New Testament record was human not only in body but also in soul. Not only his flesh but also his thoughts, emotions and will were human. There is no suggestion of a precocity more than human. Here DeWolf, influenced by the Philosophy of Personality, tries to show that Jesus pointed away from himself as a personality, enclosing the divine to the working of God which is continually breaking up old structures with the power of new life. But this Jesus Christ was as truly man as we are. If there is no 'unveiling' of God in the human personality and career of Jesus, but only a 'veiling,' how can we believe God who was in Christ? He was a true man and obedient to his parents (Luke 2:52).

Jesus Christ grew spiritually. "Only a person of limited

wisdom grows in wisdom and only a person not already in maximum favor with God and man could increase in such favor." He attracted limited attention in youth. By Mark 6:2-3, "plainly all of his actions in Nazareth had been of a kind to fall within the bounds of unmistakably human life." He experienced typical human emotions, as in the prayer in the Garden, with its struggle of faith and repeated renewal of submission to the Father's will. He possessed limited knowledge and was tempted. But he subordinated himself to God.

In the fourth Gospel, where, most of all, the unique prerogatives of Jesus are emphasized, Jesus is nevertheless quoted as insisting that he had no power nor authority of his own and as distinguishing explicitly between his will and the will of the Father. "Truly, truly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing," he says.... A clearer, more explicit affirmation of the distinction between the consciousness of the man who prayed and the being of the God to whom he prayed would be hard to imagine, even while the will of the man Jesus was subjecting itself by faith to the purpose of God.<sup>24</sup>

DeWolf's idea is that Jesus was wholly and not partly a man subject to God's rule. "The New Testament pictures Jesus as the mediator who reveals God to men and reconciles men with their Creator. But this mediator is no third kind of being suspended midway between heaven and earth. As Paul writes, 'For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the *man* Christ Jesus.' " <sup>25</sup> Nothing that is to be written here will contradict or detract from the teaching that Jesus was fully human. That he was wholly a man is the truth. He seems to say that the mistake of the dialectical theologian was not the denial of the Jesus of history, but rather the failure to be true to the real Jesus of history. Trying to see "Jesus as He really was in His life on earth," DeWolf is led "*per hominem Christum.... ad deum Christum.*"

Although the Christian faith does include a doctrine of man, it is not primarily a faith in man. It is primarily a faith in God.

From the first century until now Christians have spoken of Jesus both as man and as Son of God. DeWolf insists upon it both from historic testimony and Christological reconstruction.

At the baptism of Jesus, "a voice came from heaven, saying, 'Thou art my beloved Son; with thee I am well pleased' (Mark 1:11)." Matthew and Luke make the loftiest claims for his unique filial relationship to God. For instance, Matthew 11:27 says,

All things have been delivered to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.<sup>25</sup>

All through the first three Gospels the assumption of Jesus' unique relationship to God is perfectly apparent.

The fourth Gospel insists that the only good news of God is the absolutely good news sufficient for our absolute need. "The Gospel of John, more than any other book of the Scriptures, emphatically, constantly and persuasively teaches that we have precisely that gospel, the good news of God in Jesus Christ his Son. It is also to the Gospel of John that we are indebted for the interpretation of Jesus as the divine Word."<sup>26</sup>

But the doctrine of Jesus' humanity is not to be denied nor minimized by the teaching that he is the Son of God, and even within some Biblical affirmations of Jesus' unique divinity, a distinction is made between Jesus and God, with Jesus clearly subordinated. And it is doubtful that anywhere in the New Testament Jesus is directly said to be God. It is true that repeatedly in John he is quoted as saying that he and the Father are "one," and these passages are often cited as proving that the New Testament affirms the "full deity" of Jesus.

The Godhead and humanity of Jesus Christ are kept completely distinct and unchanged while being perfectly united "without separation" in one person. "It must be all or nothing—all or nothing on both the divine and the human side."<sup>27</sup>

Concerning Christological reconstruction DeWolf finds pitfalls in Christological thought. One of them is outright identification

of Jesus as God, as the dialectical theologians are apt to do. So does Aulen. DeWolf says,

If Jesus be regarded simply as God, then we encounter his own emphatic contrary teaching, as recorded in the Gospels, even, or rather, especially, in the fourth Gospel....Some modern theories of Christology seem to fall into this pitfall, as did the ancient Apollinarian doctrine. For example, Emil Brunner distinguishes between every man's empirical, historical personality, observable by introspection, on the one hand, and his hidden, ultimate ego, the subject and never the object of his observation, on the other.<sup>28</sup>

Thus if there is a distinction between the 'personality' of Jesus, as an observable historical phenomenon, and His 'person,' which is a hidden suprahistorical mystery, human nature separated is an abstraction. It is meaningless. This is very good criticism for a pitfall in Christological thought of the dialectical theology.

Another pitfall is explanation as a religious genius and saint. It was made by the old liberalism of the nineteenth century. DeWolf says,

We could not accept Jesus, the religious genius and saint, as our example and guide without going further. For it is he himself who continually turns attention from his power to God's power, his limited knowledge to God's perfect knowledge, from his subordinate will to God's supreme will.<sup>29</sup>

DeWolf is absolutely not an old-style liberal. "No merely historical approach to the life and teaching of Jesus can recognize him as Savior." But DeWolf insists on "the centrality of the historical personality of Jesus Christ for our faith and our salvation."<sup>30</sup>

Thus we can conclude DeWolf's Christology opposes an over-emphasis on the humanity of Jesus, by which God and man are so near that all men are divine and a Savior is not needed, and he also opposes an over-emphasis on the divinity of Christ by which God and man are so far apart that a divine-human Mediator between them becomes quite inconceivable.

### 3. Relationship Between the Incarnation and the Atonement

Although both Aulen and DeWolf emphasize two important doctrines, the Incarnation and the Atonement, there is a very different nuance between these two. The former's Christology is concentrated on *Christus Crucifixus—Christus Victor*,<sup>31</sup> while the latter's Christology emphasizes the whole life of Jesus Christ from his birth to his resurrection. In consequence, DeWolf's idea of relationship between the Incarnation and the Atonement is plain.

According to Aulen, the Incarnation is regarded as the prerequisite, the only possible prerequisite, of the work of redemption.

The incarnation itself is completed in the accomplishment of the work of redemption. The divine and loving will becomes fully "incarnate" when the work is finished.... Christ has brought the divine love into the world through his life, suffering, sacrifice, and victory. Through him the divine and loving will has entered the world.<sup>32</sup>

The Incarnation is perfected on the cross because the confession of faith in Christ is based on his finished work.

In the Latin type, the clear distinction between the Incarnation and the Atonement has disappeared. "For God is no longer the direct agent in the atoning work, Christ as man makes atonement on man's behalf. ... The incarnation is no longer a living doctrine as it had been in the days of Athanasius."<sup>33</sup>

In the 'subjective' type the emphasis depends on the accomplishment of the atoning work by the human nature of Christ. "The emphasis on the human nature now becomes an exclusive emphasis, and Christ is treated as simply the Pattern Man."<sup>34</sup> In this case the Atonement is not in any true sense the work of God.

In the classical point of view as well as Luther's point of view, Incarnation and Atonement are closely and inseparably connected. "The conflict and triumph of Christ is God's own conflict and triumph; it is God who in Christ reconciles the world to Himself. The Incarnation is the necessary presupposition of the Atonement, and the Atonement the completion of the Incarnation."<sup>35</sup> Thus the Incarnation is perfected on the cross. Aulen accepts these words: *Christum cognoscere est beneficia eius cognoscere.*

Though DeWolf insists on the centrality of the cross in the Christian faith, he does not mention the relationship between the Incarnation and the Atonement especially. His important concern is not only about the Incarnation but also the Atonement. It concerns wholly the life of Jesus Christ. The Christian faith includes a high regard for the worth of man and a lofty conception of what God intends that he should become. Although the Christian faith does include a doctrine of man, it is not primarily a faith in man. It is primarily a faith in God. Thus we have to consider what truth is implied in the historic affirmations that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. DeWolf says,

When the foes of Jesus were having him put to death by that crude and fiendishly cruel instrument of torture, the cross, they would have thought it utterly incredible that it was to become for vast numbers of people the supreme symbol, vitory and God. Surely this is one of the strangest transmutations in history.... It is true that the irony of this reversal is matched by the way in which the cross sometimes appears in elaborately carved, costly, glistening gold in churches which have quite forgotten its offensiveness. But in rough wood or costly metal, the cross is by far the best-known symbol of the Christian faith.<sup>36</sup>

Thus the cross is the symbol of Christian art. "From the earliest sermons of Simon Peter and Paul of Tarsus to the most recent appeals from the world's pulpits, the Cross has also been at the climax of preaching wherever the Christian goal has gone."<sup>37</sup> The doctrine of the Incarnation properly understood gives us the Christian apprehension of God, with all its saving power. But this is not sufficient. If the central tradition of Christian theology through the centuries has been right, the truth cannot be given without a consideration of the whole problem of sin and forgiveness, atonement and reconciliation. Thus Christology is continually passing into Soteriology.

DeWolf never overlooks the important fact of the Cross. For our salvation the Cross is ultimate. However he has not a clear statement of the concentration of the Cross as Aulen insists. His

concern is the whole life of Jesus from birth to resurrection, which is important for our salvation.

#### 4. Boundary of Christology

Both Aulen and DeWolf deny the possibility of solution of Christology. Both realize the boundary line of faith. Christology is not a closed system. It dies every day and is anew every day. It is *Christologia viatorum*.

According to Aulen, in the presence of the unfathomable love of God all attempts toward a rational explanation remain useless. He says,

Since it is contrary to the genius of faith to attempt an explanation of the unfathomable, theology must not attempt to give a rational explanation of the possibility of the incarnation. Faith cannot do more than refer the person and work of Christ to God's eternal and sovereign love.<sup>38</sup>

"When faith says that Jesus came 'in the fullness of time,' it points to a divine plan for the life of humanity, but it does not imply that his life and work can be explained on the basis of a conjunction of favorable contemporary conditions. Faith perceives, on the contrary, that the mystery of both his person and his work rests on the equipment given him by God, i. e., on the incarnation."<sup>39</sup> We possess the heart and will of the Father in Christ. Thus Christian faith must reject rational explanations of theology, as well as all others. The function of theology is not to explain the possibility of the person and the work of Christ.

DeWolf has the same boundary of faith as Aulen. He says,

Our problem is really the personal problem of our own sin. For that there is no theory about Jesus which can be offered as a solution. The only solution is for us to fall at his feet in repentance to God for our sin, acknowledge him as Lord and submit our wills anew to God whose glory we see in Christ.<sup>40</sup>

"We long for some solution of the problem Christ poses for us which would enable us to say, 'Yes, of course, God kept him true to his vocation, or He kept drawing him close in prayer where

his strength was renewed ; but I am only an ordinary man and cannot be expected to be perfectly true to my duty as he was true to his.' But no such solution can be offered without denying the very honesty of Jesus and even of God." <sup>41</sup> The first concern is to follow more steadfastly. It is interesting that DeWolf realizes this boundary line of Christian faith though he gives human reason the positive meaning unlike Aulen.

The reason why the boundary comes into both Christologies is because God cannot be comprehended in any human words or in any of the categories of our finite thought. God can be known only in a direct personal relationship, an 'I-Thou' intercourse, in which He addresses us and we respond to Him.<sup>42</sup>

This boundary had been revealed in the history of Christian thought. In the fourth and fifth centuries, the Christological controversies indicated the same boundary of Christology. In these controversies two diverse conceptions of religion, the ethical and the mystical, were struggling for the mastery. McGiffert says:

As long as these (the ethical and the mystical) were in the forefront the discussion had real vitality. When they were forgotten and details touching substance and person, nature and hypostasis, absorbed all the attention, the dispute became barren in the extreme....With the Council of Chalcedon a compromise was reached which permanently clouded the issue. Thenceforth the controversy was devoid of reality not simply because politics entered into it but also and chiefly because it had to do with metaphysical subtleties which mattered not at all either religiously or ethically.<sup>43</sup>

Here is again the boundary of Christology. As soon as the problem of Christology is approached by way of politics or by the metaphysical and purely speculative way, the true meaning of Christ is destroyed. Both Aulen and DeWolf agree to realize the boundary of Christology. Christology is not a closed system but an unclosed system where the divine love is working and where we fall at His feet in repentance to God for our sin.

(To be continued.)



# INDEX

## Chapter 1 Introduction

<sup>1</sup>Daniel D. Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians are Thinking* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1952), p. 12.

<sup>2</sup>Walter M. Horton, *Liberalism Old and New* (Eugene William Lyman Lecture) (Virginia: Sweet Briar College, 1952), p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>4</sup>L. Harold DeWolf, *A Theology of the Living Church* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1953).

<sup>5</sup>Gustaf Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church* (Eng. Tr.) (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948).

<sup>6</sup>Walter M. Horton, *Christian Theology* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1955), pp. 276 f.

## Chapter 7 Background

<sup>1</sup>D. D. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

<sup>2</sup>Nels F. S. Ferre, *Swedish Contributions to Modern Theology* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1936), p. 1.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>4</sup>*loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup>Walter M. Horton, *Contemporary Continental Theology* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1938), p. 151. Cf. H. M. Waddams, "Recent Developments in Swedish Theology and Church Life," in *The Church Quarterly Review*, 124:247, April-June, 1937.

<sup>6</sup>G. C. Carlfet, "Recent Theology and Theologians in Sweden," in *The Augustana Quarterly*, 14:1, Jan., 1933.

<sup>7</sup>Gustaf Aulen, "Recent Tendencies of Theology as Seen from a Swedish Standpoint," in *The Hibbert Journal*, 25:1, Oct., 1926, p. 44.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 46.

<sup>9</sup>This tendency was absolutely necessary that theology should break down the legal view of authority, and that the personal view of religion should be vindicated against sacramental naturalism and against a mysticism that drowned man's personality in the immense ocean of divinity.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 48.

- <sup>11</sup>H. M. Waddams, *The Swedish Church* (London: Society For Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1946), p. 32.
- <sup>12</sup>G. Aulen, *op. cit.*, 25:1, Oct., 1926, pp. 48 f.
- <sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 50.
- <sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 51.
- <sup>15</sup>Here Aulen used "All is summed up in this: *Deus Majestatis est Deus Caritatis*." But he did not use the word *Caritas* in his later book *The Faith of the Christian Church*, because of Nygren's attack on St. Augustine's conception of *Caritas*.
- <sup>16</sup>L. Harold DeWolf, *Trends and Frontiers in Religious Thought* (Tennessee: National Methodist Student Movement, 1955), p. 46.
- <sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 47.
- <sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 47 f.
- <sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 51.
- <sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 92.
- <sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 94.
- <sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 96.
- <sup>23</sup>*loc. cit.*
- <sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 99.
- <sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 129.
- <sup>26</sup>Gustaf Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, p. 60.
- <sup>27</sup>*Cf.*, *Ibid.*, pp. 60, 63 ff.
- <sup>28</sup>L. Harold DeWolf, *A Theology of the Living Church*, p. 18.
- <sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 19.
- <sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 20.

## Chapter 8 The Incarnation

- <sup>1</sup>Donald M. Baillie, *God Was In Christ* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), p. 10.
- <sup>2</sup>*loc. cit.*
- <sup>3</sup>Gustaf Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, p. 216.

<sup>4</sup>*loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup>L. Harold DeWolf, *A Theology of the Living Church*, p. 240.

<sup>6</sup>*loc. cit.*

<sup>7</sup>G. Aulen, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

<sup>8</sup>L. H. DeWolf, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

<sup>9</sup>G. Aulen, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 218 f.

<sup>11</sup>D. M. Baillie, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>12</sup>L. H. DeWolf, *op. cit.*, p. 245 f.

<sup>13</sup>G. Aulen, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

<sup>14</sup>Gustaf Aulen, *Den allmänneliga kristna tron*, p. 159. Quoted Nels F. S. Ferre, *Swedish Contributions to Modern Theology*, p. 159. I personally found development in Aulen's idea concerning God's love. Before he began to go on to constructive work his idea was "If to comprehend is to wait before the Unfathomable (of God), the Christian faith still knows no other God than the *deus caritatis*. All is summed up in this: *Deus Majestatis est Deus caritatis*." (G. Aulen, "Recent Tendencies of Theology as Seen from a Swedish Standpoint," in *The Hibbert Journal*, 25:1, Oct., 1926). Here he, rejecting the over-emphasis upon God's majesty and the distance between Him and man (as in Barth's Theology), stressed that we ought to see both of God's Love and Holiness as a unity. This emphasis on *agape* became more remarkable in *Den allmänneliga kristna tron*, 3rd edition, 1931. The most systematized book is *The Faith of the Christian Church*, where the explosive power of love which is determined by Christ and his work is expressed fully as a fundamental Christian theme. It is the English translation of *Den allmänneliga kristna tron*, 4th edition, 1947. It is not doubted that this work was influenced very much by Anders Nygren, *Den kristna kärlekstanken genom tiderna. Eros och Agape*, Part I (1930), Part II (1936).

<sup>15</sup>N. F. S. Ferre, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

<sup>16</sup>Gustaf Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, pp. 217 f.

<sup>17</sup>H. M. Waddams, *The Swedish Church*, p. 35.

<sup>18</sup>Björkquist, Bishop of Stockholm, wrote, "Our national Church shall be a Lutheran spiritual Church, where all individuals shall live their own spiritual lives, but at the same time belong to the people. The church shall not bind individuals together by laws and by the force of doctrines, but individuals shall find each other in free association." In another pamphlet (*Kyrkotanken*), he wrote, "When God thought His great thoughts, intended man, peoples and worlds, then He also intended the people of Sweden." Quoted by H. M. Waddams, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

<sup>19</sup>Gustaf Aulen, "Recent Tendencies of Theology as Seen from a Swedish Standpoint," in *The Hibbert Journal*, 25:1, Oct., 1926, p. 47.

<sup>20</sup>Gustaf Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, p. 213.

<sup>21</sup>L. H. DeWolf, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 226.

<sup>23</sup>*loc. cit.*

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 230.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 233.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 236.

<sup>27</sup>D. M. Baillie, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

<sup>28</sup>L. H. DeWolf, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 244.

<sup>30</sup>Walter M. Horton, *Liberalism Old and New*, pp. 18f.

<sup>31</sup>*Cf.* Walter M. Horton, *Contemporary Continental Theology*, p. 168.

The Barthian theology is a "theology of the Cross" (*theologia crucis*), standing in tragic uncertainty under the shadow of the Cross, beholding its salvation only as a promised "impossibility"; while the theology of Lund is a "theology of the Resurrection" (*theologia resurrectionis*), standing thankfully in the light that streams from the risen and victorious Christ, rejoicing in present salvation while it looks for greater victories yet to come.

<sup>32</sup>G. Aulen, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

<sup>33</sup>Gustaf Aulen, *Christus Victor*, (Eng. Tr.) (London: S. P. C. K., 1931), p. 169.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 170.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 168.

<sup>36</sup>L. H. DeWolf, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

<sup>37</sup>*loc. cit.*

<sup>38</sup>Gustaf Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, p. 210.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 211 f.

<sup>40</sup>L. H. DeWolf, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

<sup>41</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 254 f.

<sup>42</sup>This point is shown clearly in Donald M. Baillie's book, *God was In Christ*, pp. 114 ff. Its (paradox of divine Grace) essence lies in the conviction which a Christian man possesses, that every good thing in him, every good thing he does, is somehow not wrought by himself but by God. This is a highly paradoxical conviction, for in ascribing all to God it does not abrogate human personality nor disclaim personal responsibility. Never is human action more truly and fully personal, never does the agent feel more perfectly free, than in those moments of which he can say as a Christian that whatever good was in them was not his but God's. This astonishing paradox, so characteristic of Christianity, can be widely illustrated from Christian literature of all ages. Of course, DeWolf is much indebted to Baillie's book. Cf. L. H. DeWolf, *op. cit.*, p. 241 n.

<sup>43</sup>Arthur C. McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought*, vol. I (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932) pp. 288 f.